benefit from any of them.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Here, the parties agree that referral to a formal ADR process will not be beneficial because this mandamus action is limited to Plaintiffs' request that this Court compel Defendants to adjudicate an application for adjustment of status. Given the substance of the action and the lack of any potential middle ground, ADR will only serve to multiply the proceedings and unnecessarily tax court resources. Accordingly, pursuant to ADR L.R. 3-3(c), the parties request the case be removed from the ADR Multi-Option Program and that they be excused from participating in the ADR phone conference and any further formal ADR process.

Dated: January 3, 2008 Respectfully submitted,

SCOTT N. SCHOOLS
United States Attorney

12 $\frac{/_{S}/}{MELANIE L. PROCTOR^{1}}$

Assistant United States Attorney
Attorney for Defendants

Dated: January 3, 2008

ROBERT B. JOBE
Law Office of Robert B. Jobe
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

18 ORDER

Pursuant to stipulation, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: MARIA-ELENA JAMES

MARIA-ELENA JAMES
United States Magistrate Judge

¹I, Melanie L. Proctor, hereby attest that I have on file all holograph signatures for any signatures indicated by a "conformed" signature (/S/) within this efiled document.

ADR CERTIFICATION No. C 07-5269 MEJ